



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

INFLUENCE OF VOWEL OF DIFFERENT QUANTITY.

IN an article on Germanic \bar{a}]^{nas.} in Old English, published in volume I, pp. 471 etc., of this Journal, I showed that the short *a* of *nām* and *sām-* had so influenced the \bar{a} of related *nāmon*, **nāmjan*, **nāmja-*, **sāmira*, etc., that this \bar{a} was, for the most part, prevented from passing on to \bar{o} , as we should have expected it to do. In the foot note on page 471 I said: 'It may honestly be doubted whether a short vowel could, by analogy, so affect the pronunciation of an associated form that there should result (be produced, or be maintained against a natural tendency to change) a vowel of similar quality but long. I do not know of cases identical with those cited above, but there are very similar ones,' etc. I have since come upon identical cases. We find in Latin, *ov* before vowels and *ou* before consonants. Thus, *novem* / *noynos* (CIL. x. 2381²) later *nōnus*. This *ou* regularly became close \bar{o} [while the usual \bar{o} still remained an open vowel] and then \bar{u} , cf. *moveo* / *mūto*, antique *Loucānus* / classical *Lūcānus*, Brugmann³, I., § 218, 2. In some words, however, the influence of related words or forms with \bar{o} was sufficient to prevent the \bar{o} from rising to \bar{u} . Thus, *fōtus* / *fōveo*, *mōtus* / *mōveo*, *vōtum* / *vōveo*, *nōnus* / *nōvem*, *bōs* / *bōvis*, etc., in place of *mūtus*, *nūnus*, *būs*, etc. Similarly, *cōntio* < *cou(e)ntio*, 'coming together,' 'meeting,' continued to be associated with the many words in *co(n)-*, and thus its \bar{o} was prevented from becoming \bar{u} . But not so in the case of *nūntium* < *noy(e)ntium*; for by the time its meaning had passed from 'news' to 'announcement' and 'message,' it had lost all association with *noyos* 'new,' and its \bar{o} developed regularly to \bar{u} .

This explanation of \bar{o} for \bar{u} seems more satisfactory than that offered by Brugmann (I², p. 318), who explains *nōnus*, *fōtus*, etc. on the supposition that **no \bar{u} enos* became *noonos*, *nōnos*, etc. In *Anmerkung* 1, he shows that this could not have happened in primitive Italian but in primitive Latin, as the primitive Italian $\chi\bar{u}$ in the early form of *fōtus* had not lost its χ in primitive Italian. On page 215, Brugmann also shows that the primitive form of *nūdus* did not lose the *g* of its *g \bar{u}* until Latin times. We should thus have in primitive Latin *no(g) \bar{u} edo-* and *fo(χ) \bar{u} eto-*. Why we should then assume that in the first of these the *e* was regularly syncopated (Brugmann, § 240) but not in the second, is not clear. That we should rather assume the same syncope in both, is shown by such inscriptional forms as *no \bar{u} nos*, *cou \bar{u} tiō*, etc. (by the side of *no \bar{u} ntium*, etc.), which cannot be explained on the assumption of a blending of *o \bar{u} e* to *oo*, \bar{o} .

GEORGE HEMPL.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Nov. 2, 1898.